THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

VOL. XLI, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1934

The New Church in Iowa: the Jasper Colony and later Developments.
CHARLES A. HAWLEY, PH.D. 193

Does the Revelation of the Grand Man of Heaven Bring Practicable Implications for Earth?
EVERETT K. BRAY 209

Swedenborg's Use of Scripture for Doctrine (V)
WILLIAM F. WUNSCH 221

"The Elder Henry James." [A Review of a book by Austin Warren, Ph.D.] SAMUEL C. EBY 232

"Theism and the Scientific Spirit." [A Review of a book by Walter Marshall Horton.]
CLARENCE HOTSON, PH.D. 244

"God and the Universe." [A Review of a book by Clifford Harley.] JOHN R. SWANTON, PH.D. 252

"New Light upon the Problem of Reincarnation." [A Review of a pamphlet by D. Gopaul Chetty.]
L. ERIC WETHEY 255

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 8 Cents, and to Europe 16 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.—

President, Rev. Fred Sidney Mayer, 3812 Barrington Road, Baltimore, Md.; *Vice-President*, Mr. Ezra Hyde Alden, 1419 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; *Secretary*, Mr. B. A. Whittemore, 134 Bowdoin Street, Boston 9, Mass.; *Treasurer*, Mr. Albert P. Carter, 511 Barristers Hall, Boston, Mass.

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XLI] OCTOBER, 1934 [No. 4

THE NEW CHURCH IN IOWA:

THE JASPER COLONY AND LATER DEVELOPMENTS

BY CHARLES A. HAWLEY, PH.D.

ALTHOUGH Emanuel Swedenborg did not aim at establishing a separate church organization, it was inevitable that one would be erected on the foundations he had laid. Individuals in England, France, Germany, Holland, Sweden, eagerly received the new revelation with missionary fervor. England introduced the new teaching to America through Dr. Joseph Russell, who, after founding a society in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in 1791, moved on to New York City, the first disciple of Swedenborg in that city, though not the first in the United States. The latter distinction belongs to James Glen, who in Philadelphia on June 5, 1784, gave the first lecture on Swedenborg in America. After giving a total of three lectures in Philadelphia, Glen continued his work in Boston. Soon groups of readers of Swedenborg's writings in Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, began to disseminate the doctrines of the New Church throughout the East. In 1787 Francis Bailey published in Philadelphia "A Summary View of the Heavenly Doctrines," the first of Swedenborg's works to be published in America. Before this, however, translations of other works had appeared in England, and had been brought to this country.

The New-Church teachings were further disseminated in America by *The Freeman's Journal,* owned by Francis Bailey and edited by the poet, Philip Freneau. The latter, in the issue of October 4, 1786, published his own poem, "On the Honourable Emanuel Swedenborg's Universal Theology." But Bailey was not content to advance the cause by his journal only. In 1789 he sought subscribers for an edition of "The True Christian Religion," and secured fifty, among whom was Benjamin Franklin.* The first volume appeared that year, and the second in 1792; and its influence began to reach as far as the Ohio Valley.

The real missionary of the Ohio Valley, however, was Jonathan Chapman, better known as "Johnny Appleseed." Supplied with literature by Judge John Young, who was a convert of the preaching of James Glen, Chapman walked over the entire territory lying west of the Alleghenies north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi. He went out like the disciples of the New Testament without money or change of apparel. As he went he planted both orchards and the word as revealed to Swedenborg. To the pioneer families whose board and bed he shared, he read the Bible and Swedenborg. Many were his converts in this period eager for religion.

The first New-Church society in the United States was established in Baltimore in 1792. President Washington and Thomas Jefferson received invitations to the dedication of the church on January 5, 1800. Jefferson, always interested in religion, later corresponded with members of the society.

By this time the doctrine had spread throughout New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and by 1809 to Ohio. The first New-Church group in Chicago was founded in 1835 by Jonathan Young Scammon. Before 1838 scattered converts were made in Indiana and Illinois. The Illinois Association of the New Church was

---

*I am indebted to Dr. Clarence Hotson for calling my attention to these facts.

organized in 1839. The Census for 1830 listed five hundred members of the New Church, but there were certainly many more.

The introduction of the New Church into Iowa came not from the east but from the south, from New Orleans. This seems at first somewhat surprising, since no missionaries had penetrated into the Louisiana Territory. Oegger's *"Le Vraie Messie"* was published in Paris in 1829, but seems not to have influenced the French settlers in the New World, although its influence in France was considerable.

It was rather the German immigrants who brought the teachings of the New Church to New Orleans, and thence to Iowa. Following the Revolution of 1848 large numbers of Germans came to America to seek political, intellectual, and religious freedom. Many, however, came during the disturbance preceding the revolution. Of these earlier arrivals, several came to Iowa.

A large number of the German pioneers had objected to the efforts to produce a United Evangelical Church in Germany. Schleiermacher was one of the prime movers in the cause of union, which seemed to the more conservative Lutherans almost a repudiation of Christianity. The faction opposed to Schleiermacher came to New Orleans, and thence to St. Louis. Here they founded the Missouri Synod, which has to this day carefully guarded the orthodox Lutheran faith; and they fought any and every attempt at union or even co-operation with other religious bodies.

Another group of these German pioneers became interested in the teachings of Swedenborg, largely through the translations of Immanuel Tafel. After 1831 several societies sprang up in different parts of Germany for the study of these translations. It seems that Schleiermacher sensed the fact that many who were opposed to his teachings were turning to Swedenborg. On one occasion he visited Tafel to express his regret that he should continue to translate the Swedish theologian. But continue he did; and the Germans continued to read, and some became converts.

Among those who began to read Tafel's translations was a boy named Wilhelm Diekhöner.* He listened, read, learned parts by rote, and kept this up while learning the trade of cobbler. As a young man he determined to come to America, since he was convinced that freedom of ideas no longer could be enjoyed in Germany. In due course of time he reached St. Louis, where he established himself as a cobbler. But mending shoes he never considered his real life work. Everyone who came to his shop heard something about the Bible and the writings of the great master, Emanuel Swedenborg, before he left. Diekhöner was a man of intense conviction. Even before he left Germany he had read and thought deeply on the economic and social questions of the time. In St. Louis he at once found large numbers who shared his views. New England, Cincinnati, St. Louis, were all at this time centers of reform and reformers. About this time Emerson wrote Carlyle: "Not a reading man but has a draft of a new community in his waistcoat pocket."

With Diekhöner, however, it was the Bible which supplied the basis of his reforms. He steadfastly refused to take money for any service performed in the name of religion. Like the Apostle Paul he let his trade provide his food. As said of the early Christians, he embraced communism. Swedenborg's writings he kept always beside the Bible; they explained it and made it new. He believed the New Church had displaced all other institutions. What he wanted was a place where he might plant a colony, as so many were doing, to prove in actual life both the precepts of the Bible and the teachings of Swedenborg. Finally he heard about the fertile fields in Iowa. He began to talk about this to all who came to his shop during the week and to his reading circle on Sunday. In vivid detail he pictured what a united, consecrated band of men and women might

*It is possible that the person thus designated here and elsewhere in this paper was more correctly known under the name of H. H. Diekhöner.

do in that wilderness paradise. At last some were convinced, and began to plan during the winter of 1850 what they might do.

Wilhelm Diekhöner was the father of the movement. He went with the colonists when they finally made the journey to Iowa. He stayed with them till they lost their faith in one of his great principles, communism. Then he left them and went back to St. Louis. Some of the pioneers, who felt deeply his loss but at the same time believed in private property, gave out that he could not stand the hard Iowa winters. On his return to St. Louis he again took up his old trade. Evidently he had expended all his money in the venture, and had to start all over again. Soon after his return he was called to preach to a New-Church group in St. Louis. He adhered to his principle, never to take money for preaching the word. His congregation felt they should do something for him, and collected three hundred dollars as a gift. When they presented it, he objected, saying that he was able to support his family by his work as a cobbler, and did not wish to be paid for what to him was a labor of love. Those who yet remember hearing of his last days picture him as a sort of Apostle John,* deeply spiritually minded, a kindly, gentle, old man. His story is told here in order that the reader of today may have some idea of the consecration of an earlier period—a period when religion was a ruling power. This fine old pioneer will be referred to again, for without him it is doubtful whether Iowa would yet have been the home of an influential New-Church society.

The families which were later to found the only New-Church colony in Iowa began to leave Germany in 1844. The Schleuters were the first family to leave Bielefeld, Westphalia, early in 1844. The father was a carpenter and cabinet maker in his home town. After seventy-two days in a sailing vessel, the Schleuter family reached Baltimore,

*I am indebted to the tireless research of Miss Nellie Burmeister of Marengo, Iowa, for most of the material in this section.

whence they continued by railway to the Ohio River. Anxious to reach St. Louis, which had been pictured to them as a veritable paradise, they embarked on the first boat going down the Ohio. This boat was towed by horse and mule. Arriving at Cairo, they took another boat, and soon reached St. Louis. They were evidently still orthodox Lutherans, and remained so till they attended the reading circle in the cobbler's shop. The story goes that some of these pioneers were unable to pay their pew rent promptly in the Lutheran Church they attended, and on one Sunday morning they found the door of their pew locked. They never returned to the Lutheran Church again, but instead embraced the teachings of the humble cobbler who never took a fee for teaching the "heavenly doctrine."

The next family which deserves attention was that of Wilhelm Schloeman. They likewise lived in Bielefeld, Westphalia, where the father worked as a linen weaver. They said farewell to their friends and relatives in August, 1847, and embarked on a sailing vessel, which took sixteen weeks to reach New Orleans. Among the many stories which the family used to tell was the account of their journey. Carried out of their course after a few weeks at sea, they found themselves near Labrador, and saw floating masses of ice in the Gulf Stream. They sailed south, keeping whenever possible in sight of the coast until they entered the Gulf of Mexico in December. With unbounded joy they disembarked at New Orleans. After their long and dangerous journey, southern Louisiana seemed to them a paradise. Everywhere they saw luxuriant vegetation. They used to tell of their surprise at seeing in December trees beautiful with fragrant blossoms. But after a few weeks their joy of paradise was changed, as they set out for the new city of free Germans. The captain of the St. Louis boat feared they might be "frozen in"; but they were not to be dissuaded. Before St. Louis was reached, however, the paddle-wheels became clogged with ice, and the passengers had to get out of the boat. They walked ashore on

solid ice. After some delay they reached St. Louis, where they stayed for four years.

The exact dates when the other families left Germany seem to have been forgotten by their descendants. All were, however, in St. Louis by 1848. With the exception of the Schleuters, all came via New Orleans. The names of these families are as follows: Uthoffs, after a fourteen weeks' voyage, reached New Orleans, from Bielefeld; the Vettes from Spenge, Westphalia, where the father was the village schoolmaster; the Junkers, also from Westphalia; the Groth family from Doemitz, Mecklenberg; and the Hartmanns, the Bokhorsts, and the Naumanns, whose native villages are not known.

While these families were living in St. Louis, between the years 1848-1852, a severe cholera epidemic swept the city and changed it almost overnight. When the new colonists first reached the city they found it difficult to rent a house. A great boom was in full force. After the epidemic, however, entire streets were deserted. Mr. Bokhorst and Mr. Schleuter worked valiantly and fearlessly, caring for the sick and dying. Being intensely religious, they considered the direct command of the New Testament was meant for them. Many members of the pioneer settlers were epidemic victims. The memories and records show that Casper Uthoff lost a sixteen-year-old daughter, and perhaps other children; Hermann Schloemann lost several sons; the Schleuters also lost several children. Fear of another epidemic was one of their reasons for wishing to form a religious colony to the north.

Socially and politically the majority of Swedenborgians have always been liberals. They have felt that the teachings of the founder of the New Church should be applied also to the social system. Just at the time the Iowa group began, the economic and social theories of Fourier, Robert Dale Owen, St. Simon, and others were earnestly studied. *The Present* and *The Harbinger,* the Brook Farm publication, carried the views of Henry James, Sr., and others to St.

Louis. In this period the relationship between that city and the New England reformers was very close. The Boston New Church had been deeply interested in the community founded by Daniel Roe, one of Owen's first American disciples, at Yellow Springs, Ohio. This was made up of members of the Cincinnati New Church and was communistic. The experiment was much like that of Brook Farm. But perhaps the most decisive argument for communism was the violent reaction of these Iowa colonists to the government in Germany.

The St. Louis group, now seriously determined to form a new settlement to the north, decided to carry out what seemed to them the social and economic life of the early Christians, communism. The fertile prairie land of Iowa invited such colonies, and thither they decided to go. During the period in St. Louis, too, most of those not already converted to the doctrines of the New Church, renounced their allegiance to Lutheranism along with their allegiance to Germany. Diekhöner in his cobbler's shop had sown the good seed, and now found the harvest ready. He prepared to accompany the colony to the new land to the north, Iowa. The colonists wished to found a New-Church community where it might develop without hindrance or conflict. What place could be so advantageous as the unsettled Iowa country?

Just at this time the Indians were causing trouble to new settlers in Iowa. The colonists therefore kept this in view in determining what sort of communistic house should shelter them. The plans for the community house, like all other plans, were drawn up in the cobbler's shop, and under his direction. Moreover the name "Jasper" for the new colony was selected by him.

In January, 1851, the group selected certain trusted men to "spy out the land." For this important mission Caspar Vette, Karl Naumann, and a third member who had joined the pioneers in St. Louis, Kosfeld, were selected. As soon as the river was navigable the three men set out. Much of

the land in Iowa had been included in military land grants, and so could easily be obtained. The men reported favorably of the land and situation in what is now Iowa County. The members received their report as a part of Divine Providence, and at once prepared to take possession.

The families proceeded from St. Louis by Mississippi boats to Muscatine, Iowa. Here they hired ox carts and oxen to move their possessions as far as Iowa City, then the capital of the state. The top soil in the eastern part of Iowa is loess, extremely fertile. At this time, however, there were but the poorest roads; and after a rain loess becomes mud of an almost impassible nature. Mr. Schleuter, who seems to have assumed financial control, as Mr. Diekhöner had the spiritual, supervised the loading of the colony's effects from the boat to the ox carts. He then tried to make the owners of the carts, in order that they might take greater care, assume responsibility for any breakages. This the owners of the carts, knowing the difficulty of the mud roads, promptly refused to do. At last they started on their way, the men walking, to help prevent the carts from overturning. They reached Iowa City, a distance of forty miles, without mishap. Here they remained two days.

Mr. Schleuter hired a horse to ride ahead to set the claim stake. He rode about twenty miles to the nearest ford in the Iowa River, at a point where Homestead now stands. Here he found the river so swollen with the heavy rains that he could not continue further with the horse. Accordingly he tied the horse to a tree, tied his clothes in a bundle on his head, and swam across the river. He walked on through a tract of land which later developed into another communistic colony, the Amana, to the point where Willow Creek flows into Price Creek, a tributary of the Iowa River. Here he planted his claim stake. This site was chosen because it was near a spring of good water, and close to timber for building and for fuel. The colony never regretted the choice. The story goes that when Mr. Schleuter returned to his horse it had disappeared, probably stolen

by an Indian. This necessitated his walking back the twenty miles, and paying for the horse out of the slender community funds.

The next day the ox carts started for the new site, Lenox Township. Several of the oldest survivors have told of their surprise on seeing a log shed roofed with grass near the site. Much wonder was caused by this, which was probably the shelter of a trapper who had either moved on or been killed by the Indians. As soon as the ox carts were unloaded, the men set to work to build a log community house. The land had been purchased from the government for $1.25 per acre. (Some of this most fertile land in the middle west sold during the boom just preceding 1929 for as much as $400.00 per acre.) The community house was divided into separate parts for the various families, but a common kitchen and dining-room served all. Fireplaces furnished heat. The furniture was hand-made, with the exception of the pieces brought from St. Louis. (It was my good fortune a few weeks ago to sit on one of the original sofas brought from St. Louis, now in the home of one of the descendants of these pioneers.) Beds were berths fastened to the walls and so arranged that during the day they might be folded back to make more room. Benches were used instead of chairs. During the summer months meals were eaten out of doors.

They brought with them Tafel's translations of Swedenborg's writings; and the first New Church in Iowa was thus established in 1851 in the community house. Reverend Diekhöner, for he seems to have been ordained before the colonists left for Iowa, was the first pastor. German was spoken by all, although one or two had applied themselves to the study of English while in St. Louis.

Taking its pattern from the life of the early Christians, the colony began as a communistic organization. But as in many communistic settlements of the period, communism proved unworkable. Each family soon began to desire to own its own farm. Iowa County was one of the most fertile

parts of Iowa, and the land was cheap. In 1853, at a general meeting of the colony, it was voted to give up communism and to reorganize. The land was accordingly divided; and each family thereafter had its own farm. The Amana Colony in Iowa, which was settled later by German Pietists closely related to the Mennonites, kept strictly to communism till 1933, but is now semi-communistic.

Other families that came with the first contingent have left very little history so far discovered. Their names were as follows: the Kunz family, originally from Austria, where the father belonged to the nobility. Just why he left is not known; but he was ready to renounce his title and join the pioneer communists. A Mr. Schasick, a gardener who grew vegetables on the banks of Price Creek; Mr. and Mrs. Share, who could not stand the rigor of winter, and soon returned to St. Louis; a Mr. Valentine Hartmann, about whom nothing is known except his name.

Accounts of the new colony on Price Creek found their way to St. Louis, and encouraged several other families to apply for admission. This was granted, and in a few months the following persons joined the colony: Bernhardt Vette and his wife,—Vette was a book-binder, one of the first to ply his trade in Iowa. Hermann Biermann, who worked as a farmhand for a few weeks, then returned to St. Louis, married, and immediately brought his bride to the colony. John Burmeister, a cabinetmaker; he attended the church, but was reluctant to leave his Lutheranism. George Burmeister, a son of John, also did not unite with the New Church, but nevertheless started the first Sunday school about 1857; he also taught the day school for several years. Henry Burmeister, another son of John, was the first of the family to unite with the New Church; he taught in the Excelsior School (the colony school) in 1860-61. Heinrich Mueller and his family came in 1870; he understood both German and English, and served the colony as translator, translating not only the Word but also all the New-Church publications to which the colony subscribed.

Joachim Schultz and Christopher Volz, about whom nothing else is known.

The contacts of the colony with the outside world were through Muscatine and Iowa City. Not till 1864 was there a post-office nearer than the latter city; in that year one was opened at Florence (now Norway, Iowa), four miles distant. Not till 1880 could the colony get funds to erect a church building. Up to that time they held all their services in the Log House (the old community house) and in the Excelsior School.

About 1880 Hermann Schloemann formed a branch New-Church congregation in a rural community near Newhall, Iowa. This society continued to exist for many years.

The ministers of the New Church in Lenox were as follows:

1. Rev. Wilhelm Diekhöner. As has already been noted Rev. Mr. Diekhöner was the spiritual father of the New Church in St. Louis and later in Iowa. It is said that he could not endure the severe winters in Iowa; and in 1853, disappointed that the colony was about to abandon communism, he returned to St. Louis. He was succeeded by a member of the colony whom he had ordained as a lay preacher. Mr. Diekhöner had never received any money for his services, being devoted to the New Testament conception of communism.

2. Albert Hermann Schloemann, 1853-1863. Mr. Schloemann, as lay minister, preached first in the log house; but later he carried on his work in the Excelsior School House. He was devoted to the missionary cause, and organized New-Church groups in school houses at Parker's Grove (near Shellsburg) and at Ely.

3. In 1863 the work became too strenuous for a lay preacher, and the Rev. Gerhard Bussmann was called as pastor. After Rev. Mr. Bussmann came to the Lenox Society, Mr. Schloemann continued his work in the outlying districts. Rev. Mr. Bussmann was a carpenter, and frequently worked at places too far from the Lenox church

to be back on Sunday; and on such occasions Mr. Schloemann preached in his old pulpit. This missionary work Mr. Schloemann kept up till his death in 1875. Rev. Mr. Bussmann died in 1883.

4. The New Church in Iowa was then growing rapidly. A society began near Burlington, Iowa, called the Flint River Congregation. The Rev. J. J. Lehnen came to preach for this new society. He was one of the three first members of a little New-Church colony in Canada. He stayed at Burlington one year, and about 1875 came to Norway. Whenever there was need, he preached in the Lenox church. On the death of Rev. Mr. Bussmann he became German pastor at Lenox. He also acted as missionary for the whole of Iowa, visiting many little groups that existed at that time. Like Rev. Mr. Diekhöner he never accepted money for his preaching. His influence was state-wide, and great sorrow attended his death in 1894. As he preached in German, he especially endeared himself to the German-speaking people. When he spoke English, it was with a decided accent.

5. In 1880 a dissension began in the Lenox Society over the language question. German was beginning to die out, and the younger members of the congregation demanded a sermon in English; so the church called Rev. Stephen Wood as co-pastor to preach in English. Thus from 1880 to 1894 the Lenox Society had two pastors. They exhibited a spirit of brotherly love, by turn preaching in Lenox and looking after the various missions.

Rev. Stephen Wood was one of Iowa's most remarkable New-Church men, and his name should not sink into oblivion. He was a descendant of Thomas Wood, a Puritan, who fled England for conscience sake in 1620. Stephen was born in New York state in 1814. He began life as a farmer. Being deeply religious, he carried his Bible with him while plowing, and soon was able to repeat large sections of it by rote. Becoming dissatisfied with farming, he sought an education in Ohio, and graduated from the University at

Athens. He became proficient in Greek, Hebrew, Latin, German, and mathematics. After a brief period as professor of mathematics in Ohio University, he entered the ministry of the Methodist Church, and preached in that denomination till 1850. About that time he became convinced of the truths of the New Church. In 1854 he moved to Iowa, and taught school in Linn, Clinton, and Jackson counties. Meanwhile he preached in homes and in school houses the doctrines of Swedenborg. He made trips into the Dakotas, and was the first to introduce the New-Church doctrines in those states. He also preached the doctrines in Missouri and in Texas. In 1880 Rev. Mr. Wood was called to Lenox as English preacher, with special oversight over the young people. On August 10, 1889, he founded The General Society of Iowa for the Church of the New Jerusalem. The purpose of this society was to promote fellowship among the scattered members of the Iowa New Church. This society was for several years very successful in unifying the scattered members, securing new members, and maintaining enthusiastic interest in the work. Scholarly and cultured men and women from Iowa and from neighboring states came to attend the annual meetings. Iowa, essentially rural, thus received a great inspirational awakening for the country people. At the time of the adoption of the constitution thirty-five localities had New-Church societies. Many of these localities had their own meetings, often with out-of-state speakers. The number of members in Iowa during the years 1889-1908 was about four hundred. Rev. Stephen Wood was a great missionary, a tireless pastor, and an author of several books, of which the best known and most influential in the Middle West were: "The Formation of Plants and Animals by an Orderly Development," "The New Philosophy Applied to the Solar System," and "The New Philosophy in Connection with the Science of Correspondence." Mr. Wood died May 3, 1899, at Lost Nation, Iowa; but his spirit still lives in the scattered remnant of his Iowa church.

6. In 1895 old age compelled Father Wood, as he was generally called, to give up the Lenox pulpit. During the interim of about a year, Rev. Jacob Kimm, Rev. Wm. Adkins, and the Rev. Arthur O. Brickman supplied the church.

7. From 1896-1904 Rev. James B. Parmelee served as pastor. After 1904 the church began to decline. No Iowa missionary remained actively in the field after Rev. Stephen Wood became incapacitated, and Rev. Wm. Adkins left. Many active members subsequently moved from Lenox. Moreover a lack of finances began to curtail the services of the church.

8. One of the interim pastors, however, deserves special mention. This was the Rev. William McClung Martin, who served as "supply" from 1906-1910. Born in Fairfield, Ohio, in 1842, the youngest of twelve children, William Martin seemed destined to be a farmer. His family belonged to the Associate Reformed Church, and were very religious. At the age of twenty-six William Martin went to Iowa to teach school, at the same time preparing to enter the State University at Iowa City. After graduation he continued to teach, but his interest was in religion. About 1880 he read the article on Swedenborg in Johnson's "Cyclopaedia," which was written by Theophilus Parsons, a friend of Emerson. The article interested Martin so deeply that he secured a copy of "Heaven and Hell"; and soon afterward he and his wife announced their conversion to the New Church. After a period of newspaper work in Nebraska, he returned to Iowa in 1896. In 1901 he was licensed by the Iowa General Society as a lay minister. In 1900 Rev. Wm. Martin began the publication of *The Echo*, a New-Church missionary quarterly, published at Solon, near Iowa City, the Rev. James B. Parmelee acting as editor. This is the only New-Church paper ever published in Iowa. Its purpose was to promote the New Church in Iowa among both German- and English-speaking residents of the state. *The Echo* represents the socially radical element in the Church. Among

the important items in 1901, for example, one finds a sermon by Rev. S. C. Eby, reprinted from *The Public,* a single-tax organ published in St. Louis. Another item of interest in the issue of February 15, 1902, is a sermon by Rev. Mr. Parmelee, acting pastor of the Lenox Church, on Christian Socialism. This sermon begins with an appeal to the readers to read Henry James Sr.'s "Society the Redeemed Form of Man."*

At the beginning of the year 1901 the Lenox Church voted to have services but once each month. There were, it seems, two reasons for this: the one was financial, and the other Rev. Parmelee's interest in a Florida colony founded by Cyrus Teed, who called himself Koresh. For this reason *The Echo* began to stress the reading of books giving the New-Church point of view. Rev. Chauncey Giles' books and those of the Rev. B. F. Barrett were strongly recommended. A column headed "Books for Receivers" was also added. An interesting item in this column is the recommendation of Mrs. James E. Mills' "Leaves from a Life-Book of Today." The editor ranks Mrs. Mills as a novelist the equal of Sir Walter Scott. *The Echo* ceased publication in 1903. The many rural groups throughout the state ceased to function at this time.

From 1910-1917 the Rev. L. G. Landenberger supplied the pulpit of the Lenox Church occasionally as missionary. From 1917-1920 Rev. Franklin Baxter performed the same service. Since that time the Church has had a service once or twice each year. There is, however, hope at the present time that the old Lenox Society, at one time a great force in the Middle West, may resume some of its former activity.

CHARLES ARTHUR HAWLEY, PH.D.
University of Iowa.

---

*I have not been able to see the entire file of this quarterly, but judge its tenor may be determined from the items here mentioned.

DOES THE REVELATION OF THE GRAND MAN OF HEAVEN BRING PRACTICABLE IMPLICATIONS FOR EARTH?*

By the Rev. Everett K. Bray.

A QUESTION as a challenge has pursued me through the years of my acquaintance with the Writings of the New Church, with which, I confess, I have done little. It is the question with which this paper is concerned. I come not with a solution, but with a problem, which I believe is no imaginary one, and upon which I believe we ought to be unitedly working. It is because of the challenge I see in it for New-Churchmen and for the Church, and because I have come to the conclusion that the only way profitably to progress in the solution is to do it by the avenue of common counsel, that I have determined to outline to you, fellow members of the New-Church Club, the problem as it now stands with me, and ask your help with it.

On what ground do we stand in common in addressing the question?

It is, first, that a new revelation of truth from Heaven has been set forth before us. It is, second, (is it not?) that this truth is given for our use *now*, in this world. It is, third, (is it not?) that *every* truth of this new light, is given for use by men still in this world—given for use by, and in, the New Church; for that which is only for use in Heaven will be withheld from men until they reach Heaven—will it not? On this ground, we approach this particular question: the meaning for life here of the human-form-life of Heaven.

Let us bring the idea briefly before us. To quote some summary statements, it is:

> The entire heaven is as one man before the Lord, and likewise each society of heaven; and it is from this that each angel is a man

*An address before the New-Church Club of Boston.

in complete form, and this because God the Creator, Who is the Lord from eternity, is Man . . . [Accordingly] heaven is divided into as many general societies as there are organs, viscera, and members in man; and each general society is divided into as many less general or particular societies as there are larger divisions in each of the viscera and organs. (Divine Providence, nn. 64, 65.)

Such being the form of heaven, it is ruled by the Lord as a single man is ruled, thus as one. For although man . . . consists of innumerable variety of parts, not only as a whole but also in each part— . . . as of series of fibers, nerves, and blood-vessels, and parts within parts, still when he acts, he acts as a single man. Such likewise is heaven under the auspices and direction of the Lord.

So many different things in man act as a one, because there is no least thing in him that does not do something for the general welfare and perform some use. The general performs a use for its parts, and the parts for the general; for the general is composed of the parts, and the parts constitute the general. Therefore they provide for each other, have regard for each other, and are joined together in such a form that each thing and all things have reference to the general and its good; thus it is that they act as one. In the heavens there are like affiliations. Those there are joined according to uses in a like form; and consequently those who do not perform uses for the common good are cast out of heaven . . . To perform use is to will well to others for the sake of the common good. (Heaven and Hell, nn. 63, 64.)

Thus is set before us, without adornment, the ordered principle whereby heaven comes to be that all-harmonious, all-joyous order of life-relationships which, in our highest hopes, we would ask heaven to be. For this is the way that the life of heaven goes; this is the way that the qualities that are heavenly act. Thus it comes, "that heaven is a common sharing; for it shares all it has with each one, and each one receives all he has from the sharing" (Heaven and Hell, n. 73).

This sharing in heaven is a beautiful thing. It is the heavenly living-out of the second of the Two Great Commandments—a living that flows from the life centered in the First of these two commands. If we recognize it as this, are we not then led to look upon the new revelation of it as given us by the Lord as example and pattern of what keeping the Two Great Commandments means? Are we not?

Can we all stand together in answering this, with a "Yes"? Perhaps; but unless we have already done a great deal of thinking "all around the implications," we probably will feel impelled to add a "but" to our "Yes." There are "buts" involved, I think; though it seems to me that they do not apply to the pattern itself as an exemplification of the fruit of life lived in keeping those two Divine laws. Rather, I think, they apply to the problems of carrying them out in this world; and this for two reasons: one, that the world we live in is not Heaven; and two, that the neighbors we deal with, and the neighbors they deal with when doing business with us, are not one hundred per cent "heavenly minded" or heavenly purposed. Of course the latter half of the second, though an explanation, is not an excuse. The Lord's commands are not made in half-way terms to concede to the elements of hell that He knows will be in us. His words are, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me." "All things that ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." So we are a unit in this, I am sure, that a pattern's being difficult to follow, is not valid objection to it as a pattern, and as a standard for us to be obligated to follow. The only question for us in any given course under consideration, is: "Is it right? Is it the order of the Lord's way of life?" When the answer is, Yes, nothing releases us from the obligation to go that way.

The expression "common sharing" might very easily lead to a false picture, muddling the thought with one or another of the so-called Utopian schemes of which we have some knowledge. But it is to be kept in mind that this Grand Man sharing is according to a very exacting principle of justice; for each individual, and for each group, however small or however large, it is only in the *giving* of its best, that the best things from the other parts come to it. If one organ in the body falters in the function of its specific use, by that much all the rest of the body suffers lessened efficiency, lessened health, and so automatically and of necessity

less life will come back to that organ. The reverse is equally true. This principle seems to have been in a degree recognized in the Apostolic days of the Christian Church, when they lived a form of "sharing" life, described as "holding all things in common," and concerning which Paul decreed: "He that will not work, neither shall he eat." In the Grand Man picture revealed, we see each individual in heaven performing a use, and, indeed, the particular use which was the need that called him into being, and which remains the source of his excuse for being. In living this use, also, it must be observed, is the experience of his joy of living; so identified is each with his own special contributing use, that everything of the performance of that use is felt as an unfolding and an expression of his essential self; and his joy is the joy of self-expression in a loving, helping, outgoing of that in him which makes life to him a precious thing. This, of course, is his angelic self, the heavenly self which the Lord has given him through the journey of regeneration upon earth. We are told:

> The inmost of Divine Providence is that man may be in this or that place in heaven . . . And as the Lord foresees this, He also provides continually that man may become such; for so every one who permits himself to be led to heaven is prepared for his own place in heaven. (Divine Providence, n. 67.)

On the other hand, every one who persists to the end in refusing to be led to his intended place in the heavenly Grand Man, is led to the corresponding opposite place in hell. (See Divine Providence, n. 69.)

Perhaps this much may serve as a most general sketch from which to infer the meaning that the revelation of this Grand Man of society in Heaven, is intended to convey to us for the life of social relationships on earth.

What we have before us is a grand system of uses, which are related to one another and to the whole complex of the Lord's purposes for humanity, exactly as the parts and organs and particles of the healthy human body are related to one another and the whole body in the performance of

their several functions. Every group within this whole, and every association of groups, is in the human form,—meaning by that statement, that their dependence upon one another, and their contributions to one another, are exactly as are the respective functions of the parts of the human body to one another. This means that there is complete mutuality in all the benefits of all of their activities. This is brought to capital emphasis in the often iterated principle, that "every truth is in the human form." We are not to confuse "truths" with "facts" or mere objects of knowledge; for *truth is the light which reveals the meaning of facts and objects of knowledge;* and being so constituted as to understand "truth," we are whipped with the keen cutting reminder, as found again and again in the Writings, that *there is no truth given that does not have direction to human relationships,*—this being understood, of course, to include also relationship to the Lord.

That this universal mutuality of intent extends in the Lord's sight to the earth (even to all earths), is made clear in such statements as the following:

> All men in the universal orb of the earths, as to their souls, have their situation either in the Grand Man, i.e., heaven, or out of the Grand Man in hell. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3644.)
>
> So far as the affections, the thoughts, and the actions, have in them an end of doing good from the heart, so far man, spirit, and angel, is in the Grand Man . . . But so far as man, or spirit, has an end of doing evil from the heart, so far he is out of the Grand Man, i.e., in hell. (*Ibid.,* n. 3645.)
>
> The universal Church on the earth is in the sight of the Lord as a Man, just as heaven is; while the Church where the Word is, and where the Lord is known by means of it, is as the heart and lungs in that man. (Heaven and Hell, n. 308.)

The "heart and lungs" elements, or individuals, also will be in the human form in their relations among themselves.

In the twelfth chapter of I. Corinthians, the Apostle Paul applies this human-body pattern to the membership in the Christian Church, with the Lord as "the Head," saying: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular."

For the body is not one member, but many . . . If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him . . . many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more, those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary; and those members of the body which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor . . . That there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it. *Now* [he climaxes] ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.

"If you live this way," he may as well have said, "you are Christians in reality; you do abide in the Lord, and He abides in you, and you bring forth the living fruit which glorifies Him."

If this chapter be read in connection with the famous one on "Love" which immediately follows it, as it should be, we have a compelling picture of what Christian living meant to the first great Christian missionary to the Gentiles. And to see how it tallies with the now revealed picture of the true Christian life as it is lived in Heaven, is to be stirred by a vision of what really we might be seriously about, as Christians on this earth. Thinking of this body-pattern as Christian love in operation, read on through the next chapter. I quote but the first verse: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal." Then bring beside this the declaration from the Writings for the New Church: "It is to be noted, that life from the Lord is the life of love towards the universal human race." (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6467.)

From our consideration thus far we have this before us: That in Heaven (in the spiritual world) and in the Church (upon earth) it is the Lord's will and purpose to have the human units in each live by the human-body pattern; and it follows (does it not?) that when we are made aware that

this is His purpose for us, we are obligated, as we honor and love Him, to make it consciously our purpose, our endeavor, our program for life.

We shall not deceive ourselves. We need clear thinking on this matter. In Heaven is the only place where it will work with all perfection, because there the motive of all is pure, freely actuated by the current and directing course of the Lord's will. In the Church there are still motives which are checks and blocks against the current and directing course of the Lord's purpose, and these will have to be reckoned with in our endeavors after the human form; we shall expect that we shall have in places, and in instances, more of that form in pattern than in the spirit which is its soul in Heaven, and which gives its great heavenly joy. But the fact that we are all still in the process (if we have begun) of removing inside obstructions to the current of the Lord's will, should give us understanding when we come up against obstructions to it (and to our efforts to further it) in others. And one of the processes for their removal from ourselves will be found in our dealing with them in others, in our pursuit of the human-body pattern. The fact that we know we cannot attain to full perfection in this world, does not call for surrender of perfection as the goal; and this for the simple reason that no limit has been set as the farthest toward perfection to which earth life may be pushed. Nothing short of the perfection that is revealed can be called "the Christian goal." To be satisfied with less than the fullness of the goal revealed as Heaven, would be to be satisfied with less than heaven—and so forever to miss heaven.

Let us follow implications a next step. Since the Church Universal is so scattered throughout the whole world as to be known to the Lord alone, and since, also, the good in all men is of that Church, and all men in this world are here for the express purpose of having the potential church in them made actual, and the little good in them made more, we are to assume that all men are the "neighbor" in gen-

eral, and every man is the neighbor in particular; for as long as there is some good in a man, there is something of the "neighbor" in him; and he therefore belongs in the "human form" of the Collective Humanity of earth. Therefore, it seems to me evident that the principle of the human form must run through all humanity upon the earth, and that therefore the pattern of relationships must be here, as in Heaven, the human body. The difference between earth and Heaven will not be that of relations between part and part, but that of degree of perfection in the functioning of those relations; whereas in Heaven the form has perfect balance, or symmetry, and perfect smoothness, or health, of functioning, on earth the "proportions" and the "health" will be in the process of "becoming," rather than in the state of having fully attained.

Then I come to this conclusion: That, just as inescapably as we are born individually in the human form as to body, so inescapably are we all made parts of a collective human form, every division of which, and every multiplication of which, still holds the human form; and that, in parallel, just as the power and responsibility is vested in us to give proper care to our bodies, or to abuse them, to train them for skilful performance of sturdy or of graceful uses, or to leave them wild and clumsy to muddle through the uses which their human contacts exact of them as "tasks," to lead them wisely to maturity and discreetly in ways of health, or to stunt them and to wreck them and ruin health, just so the power and the responsibility is vested in collective units of the Social Man, to make that Man function in proportion or out of proportion, toward health or away from health.

By the Lord's purpose, we are given a common nature, common needs, the fulfilment of which includes interdependence, interrelations, and mutuality of sharing and receiving in exchanges of the benefactions that Life imparts to each in his own unique form and type—exchanges which may not rest until they have reached both to the center and

to the circumference of the humanity upon the earth. The Lord has made us "one humanity" regardless of our intentions, to the end that He may lead us to an incomparably better oneness when He can gain our confession that it is so, our gladness to have it so, and our purposed intention to co-operate in the form, according to His spirit of love towards all men.

If we come together to this conclusion, then we face a real problem, an ever active problem which we may express thus: What in the way of policy and practice does recognition of this pattern put before us, and require of us? I confess that I have not yet been able to see beyond generalities. But I am convinced that in giving us this pattern, the Lord is calling us and challenging us to an intelligent plan and manner of social Christian living upon this earth. I believe that we New-Churchmen should together come to have and pursue a common social ideal; and I believe that our constant collective obligation should be recognized, and should keep us busy working-out particulars of application in pursuit of this ideal. If we can take what has been revealed to us as pattern thus seriously, it is possible that we can all stand together (even that we cannot help but stand together), and know why we stand together—because we have a clear mandate from Heaven. And so standing, and marching, we will come to stand for something in this world that the world can see, and take notice of, and be practically profited by.

I here suggest a few things which seem to me as fundamental planks for the beginning of our building-in-common. I am not sure that the order they are offered in is in sequence of importance; I number them chiefly that they may stand out as distinct points:

I. It is a universal principle, that every individual born represents, and potentially is, and is intended to become, a particularized use which is unique with that individual alone. The same is true of every nation.

II. The law of the pattern requires that, since this is

true of each individual and each nation, the relations among individuals, and among nations, shall be such that the uniqueness of each is everywhere and in all dealings recognized, honored, and fostered—given every help to develop its proper use, and have its reward.

III. That in all dealings among individuals, and among nations, there must be complete mutuality of benefits; that each one of the parties to any transaction shall be absolutely as much concerned to see that the matter is profitable to each of the other parties as he is to see that it is profitable to himself. For it is the irrevocable law of the healthy human form that all exchanges of function-services within it are mutual to exactly that extent. The only thing that could prevent that mutuality of benefit would be some organ trying to usurp the function of some other (and thereby the benefits) while retaining its own. Where there is friction among nations, this is the cause of it. And isn't it the cause of friction among individuals?

IV. Hence, that the more each unit is helped to develop its own unique function, the more the well-being of the whole will be advanced; and the more any unit is thwarted of its best development, the more the whole will be retarded. Some things can be better done, or done to better advantage, by one nation than by others. Let that nation do those things; more than this, count it a sin against the Larger Humanity of earth, if we do not encourage and help that nation so far as possible to do those things: while we equally insist upon our nation doing those things for which it is best fitted—as far as we find out these things. This will make application in practice among the nations (and within the nations among the dealing groups and individuals), of the Pauline declaration of the Christian way, that "the members should have the same care one for another: and whether one member suffer, all members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." It is practical recognition of the truth observed in Heaven, that the life that has heaven in it is a

life of uses, and that "to perform use is to will well to others for the sake of the common good."

V. Then, as New-Churchmen, we shall have a higher allegiance than the banner of any traditional political party. We shall measure all parties, and all observed acts and policies of each party professed and pursued, by this standard we have from Heaven. We cannot elect a "party" and stand by it for life; because we have previously on spiritual grounds elected to be for life Larger Neighbor Christians, dedicated to the life-pattern of the mutual-benefit-association of dealings after the function relations in the human body. We may have to change political party association repeatedly, and sometimes be without any party that even approaches our Christian Social Ideal, and perhaps know no time when we can be really satisfied with the best available. But if we are to be true to the Church standard, we must enter open-eyed and intelligently into the nearest the Ideal that we can seek-out, and then proceed to be "the leaven" in the meal that will set some things "working" for better ways. Our slogan can never be, "My Country, right or wrong," but ever *"My Country—You must become right."*

VI. Recognizing that each unit under view at a given time is to be considered itself also in the human form, and to be subject to the same mutuality of principle for its development and function, let us turn, by way of suggestion for a line of study, to our Church. The Convention is a unit in the human form; so is each society. For the present purpose let us think of the Whole Body we may designate as The Convention Membership. Every one in this body is a potential, and an intended unique use in this body that the membership church is. He belongs to some organ of that "man," and he should be functioning with a definite, positive, use in that "man," to that "man," and from, and through that "man." Whoever comes into this "man" should come in with this expectancy; and until he puts himself out of it by a self-excluding act on his part, he should be considered "a use unit" in that "man." He should have

help, intelligently weighed and wisely and deliberately given, toward finding his very own use in that "man." We know how easy it is to be content with pointing out the most general uses (two generally), that all may share in in common, and to feel that when we have pointed out that he can come to church worship and business meetings, and he can contribute money, we have "placed" him in the "church body." But this is not dealing fairly with the "human form" of the Church. Here is no small challenge. But it is a challenge, which we must deal with—with prayer, with deepest concern, and with our most searching and sustained thought—if we are going to follow the pattern we are given.

And in application to our Church workers who have entered into the ministry,—if they have not put themselves out of the ministry, and if they remain able and eager to do the work of the ministry, some opportunity should be provided for them to do that work. If a man lacks in some of the qualifications required most in some fields, he may yet have other qualifications which are equally needed in some other field, or in some other aspect of the larger Church activities. If not, presumably he would not have been encouraged to enter into the ministry in the first place. With changing times, places may change, and available money may decline, and in some places cease; but if we are in this human form, then the whole body is concerned over local changes, and must see that, by such changes as study seems to indicate, the whole body must see to it that every part is kept functioning, is given a self-sustaining and contributing work to do. It may mean that we are meant to expand operations, on a less elegant and less comfortable schedule. But we must find out what it means, and act on that, to keep the "church man" functioning. Perhaps we shall find that the same "sharing" principle, the same "mutual welfare" principle, will imply the same practical concern for the laity within the "church man" membership. I leave it as a question to be dealt with.

EVERETT K. BRAY.

SWEDENBORG'S USE OF SCRIPTURE FOR DOCTRINE (V).

Our Employment of the Method Uniquely Employed by Him.

By the Rev. William F. Wunsch.

IN four previous papers* we have sought to sketch Swedenborg's general procedure in his use of Scripture for theological doctrine. The first two papers were occupied with showing how he could hope to draw from the highly varied Scriptures of Old and New Testament a single unified body of theology. The third paper had to do with the heart of his method; he did not merely substantiate by Scripture a doctrine he had from elsewhere, but actively and in the first instance arrived at his doctrine from Scripture. To use his terms, he drew or formulated the doctrine from the sense of the letter of the Word, in the light of the Word's deeper sense, and then readily confirmed it from the same source. Our fourth article called attention to auxiliary concepts which he employed in the formulation of his teachings, concepts retained from the scientific and philosophic period, but which now served him as parts of the framework in which his doctrinal formulations were erected.

Our concluding inquiry, in the present paper, is whether, in our entrance upon the "teachings for a new Church," we ourselves are called upon to pursue his method, so far as we may do this, or whether we are only to adopt, with whatever measure of reasoning, his results. There is a prevalent feeling that it is out of place for us to attempt his own method in seeking to establish ourselves in his teaching. We then seem, in the view of many, to be throwing the door wide to self-intelligence, instead of accepting loyally the results of revelation. At least we are told that anything more than

*See issues of April and July, 1933, January and July, 1934.

such loyal, though of course reasoned, acceptance is a superfluous labor, for Swedenborg has done all the needed work. It is well to appreciate and understand his method, but need we traverse again, in our lesser way, the path he took to his results? We have only to accept and proclaim these results.

This, it can readily be shown, is not Swedenborg's own view. For one thing, his most general description of his procedure—that doctrine is to be drawn from the sense of the letter of the Word and confirmed thereby—is more than description; it is prescription. It is a proposition addressed to others. It is plainly laid down for our guidance. I think we shall see that he urges us to understand and to pursue for ourselves the method which he employed—in the view that it is the procedure not only of the serious theological student, but also of every mature Christian mind. He is very far indeed from reserving the method to himself.

He writes, at "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 3161 (2), of three general approaches to doctrine, or ways of arriving at one's doctrine.

> Doctrines . . . are learned in part from the doctrine of faith, in part immediately from the Word, and in part by one's own study.

It is true that these different ways to doctrine may be taken at one and the same time, but as Swedenborg discusses them here and elsewhere, it is plain that they are also successively taken approaches to doctrine, as we are less or more mature. For example, he writes in the same work at n. 5402 (2):

> Every one within the church first procures the truths of faith from doctrinals, and also must so procure them, because he has not yet sufficient strength of judgment to enable him to see them for himself from the Word.

This first step—learning one's doctrine from the doctrine put forward by one's church—is also the stage, he says, in which most of those remain who occupy themselves at all with the Word. Very few proceed in the other more mature and more exacting ways named in the quotation above from n. 3161 (2).

Most of those who read the Word read it from an affection for confirming therefrom the doctrinals of the church within which they were born, whatever these may be. (N. 6047 (3e).)

While they substantiate their doctrine by Scripture, they do not discerningly and actively draw it from Scripture, though they may believe, and for very good reasons, that it has been so drawn.

Of this method of "procuring" one's teaching, and it may be the truest teaching, Swedenborg says that it leaves us not with insight, but with so much information only.

The doctrinals of the church . . . are nothing but information before one has seen from the Word whether they are true, and has in this way made them his own. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5402.)

Every one within the church first procures the truths of faiths from doctrinals, and also must so procure them . . . , but then these truths to him are nothing but acquired knowledge. (*Ibid.*, n. 5402 (2).)

Our opening citation from the "Arcana" goes on to make the same point. When this approach to doctrine is still the approach made after maturity, Swedenborg's comment becomes extremely critical.

They who have reached maturity, and still more those who have reached old age, and have not looked with their own eyes into the truths of the church, which are called doctrinals, and seen whether they are true, and then been willing to live according to them, retain them as they do any other knowledge, only in the natural memory, and thence on the lips. When they utter them, they do so not only from the interior man and thus from the heart, but from the exterior man and thus out of the mouth. When a man is in this state, he cannot in reality believe that the truths of the church are true, although he believes that he does. He seems so to believe because he relies upon others and has confirmed their teachings in himself. To confirm things taken from others is very easy, whether the things be true or false; it only requires dexterity. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5432 (2).)

It is to be noted that all this is said not of the insincere at all, but of the interested and of such as are staunchly loyal to their teachings.

Many in the church are affected by the Word of the Lord, and

devote themselves to reading it. But only a few have for their object to learn truth. Most remain in their own particular dogmas, and only endeavor to establish these from the Word. They seem to be in some affection for truth, but are not. Only those are in such affection who love to become informed in truth or to learn what is true, and who search the Scripture with this objective. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4368.)

This last citation brings into sight the second step one can take to arrive at one's doctrine—namely, to search the Scripture for it. And yet this is meant not quite so sweepingly as it sounds. We have carefully to identify this second approach, alluded to in n. 3161 (2) as "learning immediately from the Word." Swedenborg seems to be simplifying what he means here when elsewhere he speaks of searching the Word to see if the doctrine which one's church offers is true or is the teaching of the Word.

They who are in affection for truth for truth's sake and for the sake of life, consequently for the sake of the kingdom of God, have faith indeed in the doctrinals of the church, but they nevertheless scan the Word with the single end of knowing the truth from which their faith and their conscience is to be formed. If any one tells them that they ought to remain in the doctrinals of the church in which they were born, they reflect that, had they been born in Judaism, Socinianism, Christian Gentilism or even outside the church, they would have been told the same thing by those who are in the church, and that the cry is everywhere to be heard, "Here is the church, here is the church, here are truths and nowhere else," and that, in view of this, the Word should be scanned with devout prayer to the Lord for enlightenment. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5432 (5).)

A free mind is plainly urged here in testing the doctrine to which one has been brought up, whatever this is; no exception is made. Rejection of this doctrine is not the expectation or the objective; but readiness to reject it, if it should prove not to be Scripture's teaching, is essential to real search. The Scripture is even to be scanned "apart from one's doctrine"; only then is the search unprejudiced and thorough.

When these read the Word they do not look at it from the doc-

trine of the church in which they were born, but as if they were separated from that doctrine. For their desire is to be enlightened and to see truths inwardly in themselves and not from others. Those in this attitude are enlightened by the Lord, and it is granted them to formulate doctrine for themselves out of the truths they see, and this doctrine is implanted in them and abides in their spirit to eternity. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 190.)

These words from the "Apocalypse Explained" point onward to the third step listed in our opening "Arcana" quotation, the arrival at doctrine "by one's own study." There is an exploration of Scripture simply to see whether one's doctrine really arises from Scripture; remaining in it, one then remains in it understandingly. But the "Apocalypse Explained" passage points to a further process, "formulation of doctrine for oneself from the truths seen" in Scripture. Of this further activity of our own minds in the grasp of doctrine Swedenborg has much to say. It is not an infrequent subject with him. We may think it is a work of supererogation and an exercise of self-intelligence; he does not think so, but urges it, calling it the road to enlightenment. To do less is to be not sure for oneself of truth. To follow this process, moreover, is what he means by "reading the Word from doctrine"; reading in the light of a doctrine brought *to* the Word (from elsewhere) is *not* meant.

They who read the Word without doctrine or do not gather doctrine from the Word for themselves, are in obscurity about every truth, and the mind is wandering and uncertain, prone to errors, and falls easily into heresies, which are embraced if favor or authority supports one, or one's repute is not endangered. (Sacred Scripture, n. 52.)

The first thing is to gather doctrine for themselves from the sense of the letter of the Word. So they light a candle for their further progress. (*Ibid.*, n. 59.)

The candle is supplied, it is to be noted again, not by a doctrine presupposed and brought to the Word, but by the doctrine which is gathered for oneself out of the Word.

They who are illumined . . . form for themselves doctrine from the Word. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9382 (2).)

Doctrine must be collected from the Word, and while it is being

collected, the man must be in enlightenment from the Lord; and he is in enlightenment when he is in the love of truth for the truth's sake, and not for his own sake or the world's. (*Ibid.*, n. 9424 (2).)

Those in enlightenment form for themselves doctrine from the Word. (White Horse, n. 8, and Arcana references there.)

Now in this third approach to doctrine we have an imitation on our part of Swedenborg's procedure with Scripture for doctrine. The first step enumerated in our opening "Arcana" quotation—learning the doctrine of one's church and confirming it by the Word—at the most reproduces only the second half of Swedenborg's procedure, and quite as if this were the whole procedure. The second approach—the search of Scripture to see if one's native doctrine is really the teaching of Scripture—is like Swedenborg's assemblage of Scripture on a point, and examination of it to see what this body of Scripture teaches. Just as we are encouraged to make the search "apart" from our doctrine, so he of course re-examined the Scriptures apart from the accepted theology of Christendom. But it is when we are seeking our doctrine "by our own study" and formulating it for ourselves from Scripture, that we come to employ fully, though still according to our own meagre capacity, his own procedure with Scripture for doctrine. Obviously he is urging us to pursue his methods, not only to adopt, even in the fullest reasoning on them by themselves, his results.

We are prone to question whether we can have the enlightenment to follow such a free and also exacting method in pursuit of the doctrine which is to be the guide and mainstay of our living. He grants the lack of time on the part of most of us for this thorough address to our convictions (Sacred Scripture, nn. 59, 92). But he does not despair of the requisite enlightenment on our part. We are inclined to demur that he enjoyed an enlightenment which can never be ours, as indeed it cannot, and that we might better adopt his results, reasoning *on* them, not *to* them, and rest confidently in them, holding them and proclaiming them on his word as Revelator. But certainly his enlightenment nor any one

else's can be transferred to us; we can have only ours, and must have it. He urges to it.

There are two ways of procuring the truths which are of faith—by doctrinals and by the Word. When one procures them only by doctrinals, he then relies on those who have drawn them from the Word, and confirms them in him as true because others have said so. He believes them, not in a faith of his own, but from that of others. But when he procures them for himself from the Word, and then confirms them in himself as true, he believes them because they are from the Divine and in a faith given by the Divine. Every one in the church first procures the truths of faith from doctrinals, and must do so, not having sufficient strength of judgment as yet to enable him to see them from the Word. Those truths are then to him only acquired information. When, however, he is able to view them from his own judgment, if he does not consult the Word then to see from it whether they are true, they remain mere information. If, however, he does consult the Word from the affection and end of knowing truth, then, on finding it, he procures the things of faith for himself from the genuine fountain, and these are appropriated to him from the Divine. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5402 (2.)

For all this Swedenborg obviously deems us capable of enlightenment, and he knows where the enlightenment is to be had—in the affection for truth for its own sake.

Enlightenment is from the Lord alone, and is with those who love truths because they are truths and who make them uses of life. Enlightenment in the Word is not possible with others. (Sacred Scripture, n. 57.)

The Word is to be searched and it is to be seen there whether the doctrinals (to which one has been brought up) are true. When this is done from an affection for truth, one is enlightened by the Lord so as to perceive, without one's knowing whence, what is true, and is confirmed in it according to the truth in which one is. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6047.)

And many times elsewhere.

Is it not apparent that Swedenborg desires for the mature Christian mind which would enter into the teachings he was commissioned to give, that it should follow, so far as possible, the procedure he himself used in reaching those teachings from the Word? So that these teachings shall not be held as Swedenborgian tenets, but as truths, seen by us to

be truths; not as positions to be got from his works, but as living truths arrived at "from the genuine fountain"? Repeating his procedure we shall be carried into his results as never before, with an appreciation and an insight otherwise lacking. The mind of the Church in general will become a discerning and a growing mind.

Indeed, the mind of the Church can even expect then to advance at one point or another in the great body of teaching into new insights and further results. This strikes many as a dangerous suggestion, just as examining the Word to see if one's doctrine is true seems to them a sign of doubt and a note of disloyalty. But we have only to bear in mind the supreme conviction which has dominated all Swedenborg's discussion of this mature arrival for oneself at one's doctrine from the Word.

> The Word is more than any doctrine in the world and more than any truth in the world. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9372 (5).)

Scripture may well yield still more, for example, on the subject of the Divine Providence than has been compacted into that sweeping and precise treatise on the subject, "Angelic Wisdom about the Divine Providence." The teaching there is formulated, for one thing, much more in the framework of that philosophy of the world which Swedenborg had set down in "Divine Love and Wisdom," than it is from Scripture. But the Old Testament, especially, is the grand source of teaching about the Divine Guidance. It records the history of a peculiar people interpreted by its prophets to reveal the hand of God in each event. Nowhere else is the Divine Providence so exhibited as it moves on the stage of history. Surely not all that can be drawn from Scripture on the theme of Providence has been drawn from the Old Testament as yet, nor does it promise ever to be, if the Word is more than any doctrine in the world. The enlightened and mature procedure of forming doctrine for oneself from the Word may attain insights not explicitly rendered in "Divine Providence." To illustrate: Providence is the government of souls endowed with moral freedom,

and also the conducting of the natural order according to inexorable laws. The book, "Divine Providence," is chiefly on the former topic; it has not so much to say on the conduct of the natural order, and it has very little to say on the government of this order as the latter impinges on and affects our spiritual life. Is there not something to be won from the Word about the way the Divine handles the pressure of the mechanism of nature and of the physical on our spiritual life and possibilities? Again, the problem of pain looms large in a doctrine of Providence, but the word "pain" is not to be found in the usual indexes to Swedenborg's works. In "Arcana" n. 1755, Swedenborg enumerates five different aspects of the unwearied and varied operation of Providence. Once more, are these all the discernible aspects? Active provision of the best by God; His acceptance of a lesser good; His toleration of evil and disorder; His patient waiting in the non-moral and spiritually unawakened; sufferance of departure into evil; these aspects the "Arcana" names. Is another aspect, very prominent in Scripture—namely, the steady redemption from evil to good —not an equally salient aspect?

We called attention in our fourth paper to the fact that Swedenborg formulated his doctrine about the Second Coming not so much from Scripture as he did in a setting of concepts taken from the general idea of cycles in the religious life of mankind. He did not formulate that doctrine, as he did most, from the sense of the letter of the Word. He did not do so in the chapter (xiv) on it in "True Christian Religion." The Church has not undertaken such a formulation. As we noted, the thought of such a formulation has even been despaired of. Yet it is a pivotal doctrine in the whole body of his teaching. It must also have a basis in the plain sense of the Scripture or be outlawed. And after all, the Scriptures in their sense of the letter do broach the thought of a Return on Christ's part. The Lord discussed the prospect with four of His disciples. These Scriptures can be collated, and they can be evaluated—the

Lord's own words will be given more standing than those of followers who set down their apprehensions of what He said. From these assembled and evaluated Scriptures the doctrine can be formulated like the rest, in the light of the deeper meaning of the Word, i.e., with light and detail drawn from that meaning. If not, then we must conclude that a pivotal teaching is not susceptible of the procedure which is prescribed for all doctrine of the church—namely, that it is to be drawn from the sense of the letter and confirmed thereby. It would also be an exception to the statement that all the doctrines of the New Church can be found in the Word's literal sense. The attitude of mere adoption of what has been done, leaves a necessary work undone. On the other hand, the attitude toward doctrine with which this paper has to do, namely, of gathering one's doctrine for oneself from Scripture, would inspire and spur the mind of the Church to formulate this particular teaching forcefully from the Word. Such a formulation, well carried out, would be an addition to the Church's studies much to be desired.

In these two illustrations, on the subject of the teaching of Providence and on the subject of the doctrine about the Second Coming, we have sought only to indicate what a large and discerning mind would be encouraged in the Church were we to appreciate well what Swedenborg has to say on the various ways to doctrine, less and more mature.

To sum up,—it is to be freely granted, and indeed it is gladly emphasized, that the method of using Scripture for doctrine which we have described in these five papers was uniquely employed by Swedenborg. There is no equally full employment of it possible to us. He did his work in the discharge of a mission which is not laid on us; he had undergone a preparation for that mission which was unique as the mission was; not so much his personal religious experience, as the public privilege of open intercourse with the spiritual world, put him in an unrepeatable situation for enlightenment in his work; and even the assisting concepts

retained from his earlier period and employed for his theological work were peculiarly his to use at the full. To act as a Revelator was his role, and is not ours.

But while the identical use of his method for doctrine from Scripture is out of our reach, all use of it is not. His use of the method must always supervise our use, but it will also inspire use by us. He plainly does not reserve it to himself, but urges it upon every mature religious mind. The less adequate procedures for doctrine which he criticizes, I think it is plain, he would still find inadequate and partial though practised upon his own results. The doctrine "for a new Church" is to be gathered from the sense of the letter of the Word and substantiated thereby. It was so formulated by him; but each man who would enter well into it has the same road to take to it, and has to gather it for himself from the Word. He will then hold it with an insight grounded in the Word of God or from "the genuine fountain," and on the basis of a discerning faith of his own.

William F. Wunsch.

A LIKENESS OF HENRY JAMES, SENIOR.

By Samuel C. Eby.

IT IS just fifty years ago this last summer that I first gave a well-intentioned promise to my friends Lydia Fuller Dickinson, of St. Louis, and Eleanor B. Kinmont, of Glendale, Ohio, to write an appreciation of Henry James. They both placed in my hands all the letters they had received in their correspondence with him. That this promise was never fulfilled was due partly to the multiplicity of engagements that consumed my days, and partly at first to my unwillingness even mildly to disappoint the expectations of these devoted ladies, whose admiration of their mentor was scarcely "this side idolatry," while mine, though sufficiently ardent, was tempered by a reasoned impartiality and a scrupulous regard for fair play.

I wish these good women were now where they could have a reading of Professor Warren's judicious and scholarly volume, "The Elder Henry James."* To my mind this book is a remarkable piece of work. The author's acquaintance with his subject is limited to the last ten years, and yet his attitude of "sympathetic detachment," abetted by his mastery of modern biographical method—with its insistent habits of research and its particularity of documentation—has enabled him to produce a life that cannot fail to please every Jamesian reader. The wealth of material it provides for estimating the man and his avocations gives a new significance to the range of questions that interested James and enlisted the support of his pen. Professor Warren's success is all the more admirable when we consider that Henry James was never long satisfied with any of his own books, although each was written with the

*_The Elder Henry James._ By Austin Warren. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1934. xvi + 269 pp., 12mo. $2.50.

enthusiastic conviction, "They are bound to listen to this!" He was very desirous of being heard; and yet, notwithstanding his uncanny insight into the abstruse and his superb rhetoric, he was his own worst adversary in misrepresenting himself. Not in spite of, but rather because of, the contradictions and conundrums he presents, he ought to be read, not only by every Swedenborgian student, but by every advocate of spiritual truth in other schools of thought who sincerely respects his own scholarship and gives due weight to the intellectual resources of the decades in which Mr. James's life was passed. For he certainly expounded a very virile and fruitful philosophy; and, incidentally, the phases of that philosophy which he especially accentuated cannot be found better drawn than in Professor Warren's book.

In his fourteenth year, while playing with a fire ball in some way used in connection with his school work, Henry met with a serious accident. Saturated with oil, his clothing was instant fuel to the flame, and he was so injured that one leg had to be amputated. His consequent illness and suffering, aggravated by the inept and bungling surgery of those non-anaesthetic days, lasted through two years. Professor Warren, referring to James's superiority in after years to this handicap, remarks: "His physical disability did not have the effect of driving him into absorption with his books any more than it hindered his participation in social life." He might have added that to that "baptism with fire" and its succeeding vigils of imprisonment, James's readers, in a high degree, owe their enjoyment of the sturdy independence and steadfast tranquillity dominant in all his writings. A bright boy of thirteen to fifteen conquering in that sort of experience with elemental nature could not fail to carry away a courage and insight that would stand him in great stead in the crises of his personal and intellectual culture. The ordeal undoubtedly became to his imagination an outward and visible sign of the influence on his mind of the inhospitable Calvinism of his childhood and of the unfruitfulness of the theology that courted him at Princeton.

Despite his smiling and courageous acceptance of this disability, Mrs. Dickinson was of the opinion that the physical inhibitions must have irked him sorely. "He was just the man that would have loved to 'get up and get,' " was her comment. She bears testimony to James's adjustment to his impediment. He has been described as a gentleman both of the old school and the new. On one occasion Mrs. Dickinson took an old friend, a Swedenborgian minister who was a warm admirer of James's books, to call on him. To her horror, before the introductions were well over, her fellow visitor exclaimed, "Why, you're lame, aren't you?" "But," she said, "Mr. James was always equal to anything like that," and with the utmost good-humor gave his visitor a swift and graphic account of the tragedy of his boyhood, to the utmost satisfaction of that gentleman's curiosity.

The first momentous event in Henry James's larger evolution was his abandonment of his old religious landmarks. He had gone through Union College, and with the idea of entering the ministry he spent two years and a half at the theological seminary at Princeton. There he eventually found himself at outs with professors and fellow students on all counts excepting his personal popularity. He decided on a radical change of scene—a complete holiday from Princeton and all it stood for. In 1837 he made his first visit to England and at the same time traveled to Ireland, where he acquainted himself with the home surroundings of his father's forebears. Princeton never saw him again. His dissatisfaction with the seminary and its personnel speedily ripened into a thorough repudiation of the whole scheme of orthodox theology. But the precise Jamesian quality of this conversion from the conventions of the old faith was that he could not adopt a negative attitude to the deep problems of human consciousness. He had no relish for either agnosticism or atheism. His rejection of creeds implied no renunciation of religion. However far or fast his doubts might travel, the objective was not denial but affirmation. He set about diligently seeking the pearl of great price to

adorn his swept and garnished mind. He turned his attention to the secular exponents of religion, having deliberately disallowed the authority and competency of the clergy.

So it came to pass that, on this first visit to England, he fell in with that eminent man of science, Michael Faraday, who was a lay preacher in the slender sect of the Sandemanians. Professor Warren renders a special service to James's memory by the clearing up of his temporary attachment to Sandeman and his group. Sandeman's style of writing was strikingly like that of James. He was a champion of the sharp distinction between the Christian life and moralism. There were no paid clergymen among them, and the aim of the sect was to return to the ways of Primitive Christianity. James soon passed out of the sphere of Sandemanian rites and dogmas, but the intellectual clarity and spiritual vigor of the movement left an abiding stamp on his mind.

In 1840 James married Mary Walsh, the sister of a fellow student at Princeton. She was a woman of extraordinary common sense and with an intuitive comprehension of the needs of her husband and of the gifted children that came with the passing years. Hence their domestic life was distinguished by a singular and persistent felicity, due largely to James's own blitheness and inherent gentlemanliness to those nearest him, but due far more to his wife's universalizing fellowship. After more than forty years of life together her husband described her as the "divinest reality" he had ever known. The children themselves and intimate friends of long standing bear testimony to her unobtrusive, all-pervasive influence for harmony and understanding. The perfume from her alabaster box of ointment filled the home with love. She passed away in February, 1882, and James followed her in December of the same year. Writing to an old friend in the interim, while engaged on the revision of a book he had in hand, he exclaims: "The making of the book has been my only refuge against the suffering involved in the loss of my wife. . . . Even now I am miserably

feeble, and look forward to nothing with so much desire as to a reunion beyond the skies with my adorable wife."

The parents' sympathetic co-operation in all that concerned the children was remarkable. James's personal interest in the welfare of his offspring reminds one of Swedenborg's report that the inhabitants of Jupiter found their chief business in the education of the children. William, who came to write philosophy with all the witchery of fascinating fiction, and Henry, whose charming novels teem with astute psychological analysis, are known to all the world, and ought not to be skipped by any one who aims to know either philosophy or letters. Alice, the youngest of the five children, was an invalid from her eighteenth year, but was unmistakably her father's daughter in intellectual perception and pungent, colorful comment. Professor Warren has little to say about the two younger boys—Garth Wilkinson and Robertson. One cannot help feeling that the picture is not wholly true without something to indicate the smudges that must have touched the canvas athwart the clearly drawn and brilliant lines always evident in the portraits of the two Henrys and William. While yet in their teens, these younger boys enlisted in the Civil War, and were badly used up when the war was over. My friend of many years, Mary Chauvenet Holden of St. Louis, who at one time knew Robertson James, gave me the impression that "the little cock-sparrow Bob," as Professor Warren characterized him as a boy, evidently kept on being critical and peppery. She stated that he had taxed his father with having been inspired with ambition to build up a new sectarian cult when he gave up the old faith and took to the expounding of Swedenborg. Also when she tried to get him to tell her something personal about his father, it seems odd that he should light on an anecdote that might be construed as exhibiting the temperamentalism of Henry James's private dislikes. His father and he were returning from somewhere, and in an interval of delay the elder James gazed intently out of the carriage window, when suddenly he turned and

threw himself back in the cushions, ejaculating: "Bugs! Bugs! How I hate them!" "What? Whom?" inquired the son. The father replied by pointing out of window. Three fat priests filled the scene, enjoying God's free air in their own way.

Henry James's disaffection with the Swedenborgians was not an afterthought, nor was it of their making. He had thoroughly "gentilized" or non-churched himself in his early elusions of Presbyterianism and Sandemanianism. His self-sufficiency in appraising Swedenborg was to be expected from his previous independence both with his father and with the Princeton professors. He had concluded that there was nothing in the Gospel, or in his conscience, or in Swedenborg that laid him under any obligation to belong to or coincide with any clique or sect or organization. His own private taste and judgment must be the sole arbiter of his action, whether he was to join or not to join any group whatsoever. Thus far he was no solitary in his preferences and decisions. Since Swedenborg's death to the present day considerable numbers of those who have endorsed his teachings have kept on quietly enjoying and disseminating in their own way the truths freely given and cordially accepted. For their choice many reasons are forthcoming. As for James, he could never conjure up the slightest interest in Mr. Hindmarsh's New Jerusalem. He spent no time in building new walls on old foundations. He took the ground that there could be no amalgamation or continuity between the old and the new limitations determining life and thought, and insisted that the New Church of Swedenborg must be absolutely discreted from every form of the ancient ecclesiasticism. Swedenborg had very wisely left the whole question open, knowing that all outward forms of society, whether old or new, must change with the general form of each stage of civilization, and be bent hither and yon entirely in conformity with transitory conditions and the popular inclination. Hence he had no interest in prescribing or abolishing forms of worship or of

charity or of social activity. Contrariwise, James, quite unconsciously, is here uselessly dogmatic, since men can always be trusted to do as they please in these matters. What they need, and Swedenborg provides the philosophy for this, is freedom from all the old restraints and inhibitions. Of course, the New-Church people did not like incessant criticism, even when much of it was good-natured, and some of them looked askance at him and his books, and even affected to ignore him. The story was told that on one occasion in Cambridge, Professor Theophilus Parsons, himself a sort of pivotal man among the Boston Swedenborgians, passed him on the street without deigning recognition. James turned and called after him: "Parsons! I say, Parsons!" The Professor stopped and walked back. "Oh," announced James, "I have nothing to say. I only wanted to make sure that you saw me."

Yet, while James was unquestionably sincere in his contentions for the exclusive spiritual character and substance of the New Church, his rodomontade directed at the Swedenborgians was for the most part purely Pickwickian. Mrs. Dickinson, who was the most philosophical as well as the most devout of James's disciples I have ever known, and who at the same time was a veritable mother in Israel in the St. Louis New-Church Society, relates that on one occasion when she was visiting with Mr. and Mrs. James, the conversation turned on the New Church, and he launched on a tirade against the Swedenborgians and their fads. After his eloquence had disported itself for a space, Mrs. James interposed, "Oh, Henry, don't talk like that about the Swedenborgians. Mrs. Dickinson will think you mean it." "Well, don't I?" he retorted with a chuckle. As time went on even this semi-bantering mood was softened, and shortly before his death he expressed himself in kindly terms concerning members of the organization, asserting, "They are good people." When this episode was reported to James Reed, lifelong pastor of the Boston New-Church Society, he

smiled and asked, "Did he really say *that*?", being visibly pleased.

Professor Warren shows his talent for biography in stressing Henry James's capacity for friendship. Among the friends of his college days was Professor Joseph Henry, one of the more liberal instructors of the seminary. He doubtless had an important hand in shaping the early bent of James's thought, and the correspondence between the two is the chief source of information concerning his 1837 visit to Europe. Through him he was apparently made acquainted with Michael Faraday, when James was on the trail of Sandemanianism, Professor Henry being of the same scientific ilk as Faraday. Another friend made in Princeton was Hugh Walsh, who shared James's sentiments and scruples, and left at the end of a year to exchange the ministry for medicine. Parke Godwin was another of James's classmates, and the friendship cemented between these two was destined to last through life, one of James's last letters shortly before his death having been written to this friend of his Princeton days. After James's return from Europe and his marriage, his association with Ralph Waldo Emerson began, with its mutual admirations and curious twisting of friendly animosities. During the long range of his more active life he knew all the important Americans whose friendship he desired, and on his second visit and long stay in Europe he made the acquaintance of Garth Wilkinson, Thackeray, Carlyle, Tennyson, James Spedding, John Stuart Mill, Frederick Denison Maurice, John Sterling; in fact, he came to know all the distinguished men in the public eye at the time, and of many of them he left picturesque and penetrating sketches or impressions.

As the years advanced and James made up his mind to settle down permanently in his Cambridge home, his desire for friends and his need of expression both turned his energies in the channel of epistolary correspondence, in the main with ladies who had been attracted by his ideas and his manner of presenting them, and some of whom he never

saw. Many were the thrills brought to him by the postman when letters came to hand from Missouri or Ohio, from New York or California, from England or Scotland, from very bright women, most of whom had made their hearts rule their intellects in the desire to learn more about God and Society. Many of James's letters in reply might have been published as additional chapters in "Christianity the Logic of Creation" or "Society the Redeemed Form of Man."

James began to read Swedenborg in 1844. In the same year his friend Parke Godwin published his "Popular View of the Doctrines of Charles Fourier." This would indicate that he had been studying Fourier for some time, and it is apparent that he had a considerable influence in turning James's thoughts to the French publicist. For several years James was content to run with the Fourierites. He published anonymously "Love in the Phalanstery," a translation of Victor Hennequin's *"Les Amours au Phalanstère,"* wholly in exposition of Fourier. He became a steady contributor to *The Harbinger,* and wrote a large number of articles for its columns. He was in at the finish of this magazine, waterlogged with controversy. It seems a pity that he fell on Fourier before he had a chance properly to appraise and digest Swedenborg's deeper pronouncements on the themes germane to that writer. A man might easily rectify his personal views of religion by a superficial acquaintance with Swedenborg, either by skimming through his numerous tomes or by carefully reading only one or two volumes. But philosophy—and James was from the first predetermined to the philosophic—that is a quite different matter. In 1844 the Swedenborg Association had recently begun, with Dr. Wilkinson as its bright particular star; and none of the translations of Swedenborg's *Opera Philosophica* had yet appeared, with the one exception of Dr. Wilkinson's edition of "The Animal Kingdom," which had been published the previous year; and James had had scant opportunity to contrast Swedenborg's doctrine of series, for ex-

ample, with that of Fourier. James's first book essaying to expound Swedenborg is greatly weakened by this Fourieristic obsession. He later soft-pedaled on Fourier, and finally let him go by the board as no longer having any philosophical hold on his thought.

Out of his Fourier attachment grew the discussion on marriage in *The New York Tribune,* in which Horace Greeley, Stephen Pearl Andrews and Henry James were the combatants. The controversy ended when Greeley refused to admit any more contributions from Andrews, who then issued a little work on "Love, Marriage and Divorce," incorporating James's letters with his own. James does not appear to advantage, because he is laboring to state his case in the ears of an opponent who presents a very acute definition of marriage as being both physical and mental, and therefore to be easily grasped by any one of ordinary intelligence, but an opponent who has no regard for and no knowledge of a spiritual factor. James later did much better in his effusions on marriage and the woman question, when not embarrassing himself with controversy. Professor Warren disposes of this whole phase with great perspicacity. He alludes to Stephen Pearl Andrews as charging James with being a purely ideal reformer, saying: "He hates actual reform and reformers, and regards benevolence as a disease." Andrews himself was a reformer of vast economic intelligence and of terrible sincerity. Before the war he advocated the abolishment of slavery by purchase, holding that, our laws having made slaves property, their owners were entitled under the law to the price of that property. He would have followed England in removing the blot from the escutcheon by justice rather than by force. That would have saved the Republic many thousands of lives and millions of treasure, as well as three-quarters of a century of ill-feeling and bad blood; but his home in Houston, Texas, was mobbed in token of popular appreciation of his theory and his patriotism. Within the last year his son, Dr. C. L. Andrews, my friend for decades, passed away in his eighty-

fourth year, a casualty of our war with depression. One night he saw a poor derelict in an uncomfortable and perilous position in the subway, and with his own arms he removed him to a place of safety, the act turning out to be quite beyond his strength. Men of this sort, fathers and sons, are reformers by birth and from the ground up.

Nevertheless, I should agree with Professor Warren in defending James's attitude as an ideal reformer. Warren puts Ralph Waldo Emerson in the same category; but does not quote Emerson's retort, which was very neat. When taken to task for his inaction in the work of abolition, he countered with the question, who would then free his slaves —the ignorant, blind, stupid slaves of tradition and the other tyrannical oppressors of human thought? Henry James might, too, have rejoined, "Who, if I keep silent, will take up arms against those adversaries of the soul who would love to see forgotten and ignored the paramount truths that God alone is life and that all men may enjoy the most abounding vitality through and in his divine natural humanity?"

In his preface Professor Warren informs us: "In this book I have been chiefly concerned with presenting James in his own characteristic language. I explore; I interpret; I do not pass judgment." When I sat down to write this review of "The Elder Henry James," it was with the intention of giving a succinct statement of the origin of and the issues raised in each one of his books, and of relating my personal reaction to the several volumes; but I find that I have been enamored of Professor Warren's mode of procedure and have used up all my space in considering James himself and his surprising contacts with his associates, so that my criticism of his engaging writings must wait. Warren adds: "In a subsequent volume, 'The Age of Emerson,' I hope to give a considered estimate of the cause James served—in other words, to speak as a critic." Perhaps the appearance of that promised volume will furnish me with the occasion for attempting to elucidate James's teachings as a whole.

I wish to repeat my belief that Henry James's books are of the utmost importance to every reader of Swedenborg, whether he goes with one of the organizations or goes it alone. At a little social gathering in Stockholm—Swedenborg's home town—I was surprised and pleased to hear my host, owner of a name classic from the earliest days among the followers of Swedenborg, declare: "Mr. Eby, what we need above all in the New Church is men who can state the truth philosophically." That does not mean with metaphysical terminology or with abstrusely difficult mental gymnastics. The healthy mind of every normal child loves to know why; and the newness of Swedenborg's New Church means that every child may grow to man's estate and travel on to the end of the way, becoming increasingly rational and full of light. It is of his human nature to go through every door understandingly. Henry James illustrates this law. He grew wiser with the years, and his last book was his best.

S. C. Eby.

A RECENT CRITICISM OF SWEDENBORG.

By Clarence Hotson, Ph.D.

PROFESSOR HORTON, of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, has given us in his book on "Theism and the Scientific Spirit"* an interesting survey of modern religious thought in relation to the philosophical and scientific ideas of the recent centuries. The titles of his chapters suggest the range of his discussion. In Chapter I, "God in the Copernican World," he selects Blaise Pascal and Baruch Spinoza as the most significant figures of the seventeenth century. In Chapter II, "God in the Newtonian World," he defines the scientific spirit of the eighteenth century as the empirical or mechanical spirit, considers Sir Isaac Newton as scientist and as theologian, and then discusses Thomas Paine as a typical Deist, and Emanuel Swedenborg as a typical "mystic." In Chapter III, "God in the Kantian World," he treats the dialectical or transcendental spirit of the Kantian age, discusses Immanuel Kant as scientist and as philosopher, and Johan Gottlieb Fichte as a typical transcendentalist. The chapter ends with the promise and failure of the idealistic movement. In Chapter IV, "God in the Darwinian World," he defines the scientific spirit of the Darwinian age as the genetic spirit, and discusses Charles Darwin's influence on religious thought, George John Romanes and the destructive implications of Evolution, and Henry Drummond and its constructive implications. In Chapter V, "Science and Theism Today," he discuss the new scientific revolution, the new atom and the new cosmos, the new religious realism, and Edward Le Roy and the "Problem of God." The book ends with a suggestive epilogue on "The Future of Theism."

**Theism and The Scientific Spirit.* By Walter Marshall Horton. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1933. xviii, 231 pp., 12 mo. $2.00.

Our main concern with this book, of course, is with its treatment of Emanuel Swedenborg. Though it is gratifying to find in this book an approach to adequate appreciation of Swedenborg's historic importance in modern religious thought, we must observe that the author makes a number of plausible objections to Swedenborg's claims to Divine enlightenment. These objections cannot be ignored, but must be answered. At the outset we must protest against the application to Swedenborg of the term "mystic," a term which, in the absence of specific definition, merely betrays an attempt to use a word in order to cover up the lack of a definite idea. Was Abraham, in Professor Horton's view, a mystic? Was Jacob, or Moses? Were the Old Testament prophets, in the author's opinion, mystics? Or the Evangelists? Was Saint John a mystic? Or Saint Paul? If all these were mystics, then perhaps Emanuel Swedenborg was one likewise. We regard him as a prophet, an apostle, a religious reformer, the instrument by which a new Divine Revelation was conveyed from God to man. If the term "mystic" comprehends all these meanings, why use it instead of the other terms? If it means something else, what is that something? As commonly applied to Swedenborg, it is a derogatory epithet used by persons who thereby confess their disbelief in a continuous Divine revelation.

The general sketch of Swedenborg's life, pages 60-64, is accurate enough in the main, and shows an attempt to be fair. In the subsequent pages, however, the author evades his main problem by quoting Kant's remarks about Swedenborg, and then alleges that nowadays

> We know many facts about the early life of the seer which cast light upon his mystic experiences; and we have a great mass of material on the psychology of mysticism, which enables us to view his case as less strange and isolated.

Professor Horton tries to explain Swedenborg's revelations by certain facts of his biography, citing the piety of his father, the good Bishop Swedberg, and the seer's own precocious interest in theological questions, as early influences

which largely counteracted the effect of his subsequent interest in mathematics and natural science. Considering first the philosophical and then the theological works, Professor Horton remarks:

> Apparently, the angels told Swedenborg very little that he had not already understood, pretty well, by the natural light of reason. (P. 71.)

Anti-Christian sceptics might say, similarly, that in giving the Ten Commandments, the Lord told Moses very little that the great Jewish leader did not already know. And sceptics generally will doubtless make the most of the same argument in both instances.

Professor Horton ascribes Swedenborg's spiritual experience entirely to a powerful visualizing imagination, to visual and auditory hallucinations, and dreams. This is the sceptic's favorite explanation, not only of Swedenborg's experience, but also of that of the Old Testament prophets and the New Testament apostles. Paul's vision on the road to Damascus, on this assumption, was a visual and auditory hallucination. All Divine Revelation, on the same hypothesis, is merely delusion and madness, and all religion is mere superstition. To the religious man there seems to be something wrong with the assumption. The kind of argument Professor Horton employs appears from the following specimen:

> Had he been a different man in his youth, with a different philosophy, the Lord would have revealed a different religion to him in his old age. (P. 74.)

Doubtless the same thing could have been said of Moses or of many of the Old Testament prophets. Professor Horton might well have reflected, we submit, that although it is the Lord's privilege to choose His messengers as He will, a prophet's early training is likewise a legitimate concern of the Divine Providence. Or does Professor Horton perhaps imagine that the Lord should have chosen for an inspired writer of one of the Old Testament Scriptures, one

quite ignorant of Jewish tradition? Or for the Evangelists, men who had no interest in Christ? Or for the inspired writer of a new Divine Revelation, which was to reconcile Christian faith with natural science and with reason, a sceptic or a man void of learning? If so, he must have a strange conception of Divine Revelation. Here is another specimen:

> If the reader has any lingering faith in Swedenborg as the bearer of an infallible revelation from on high, let him open a volume of the *Celestial Arcana* and compare its interpretation of Scripture with any sound scientific interpretation of the same passage, based on a knowledge of its real historical setting. (P. 74.)

This criticism assumes that the only possible significance of Scripture is that which arises from "sound scientific interpretation based on a knowledge of the real historical setting" of a particular passage. There is, then, no such thing as a universal spiritual significance of the particular events of Scripture, a significance arising by application of the science of correspondences, together with spiritual enlightenment of the Christian reader. The widespread idea that the epic of Israel has some application to the Christian's own spiritual progress is, according to Professor Horton, purely fanciful. There is no such correspondence. The more systematic and consistent the interpretation of Scripture by types and symbols, the less Professor Horton approves of it:

> I cull a few interpretations at random from the Swedenborgian *Dictionary of Correspondences: Aaron*—divine truth proceeding from the Lord. *Ass*—natural truth. A she-ass, the definition of natural truth. Son of a she-ass denotes rational truth. Wild ass, truth separate from good. *Stomach*—corresponds to the world of spirits, which is in the midst between heaven and hell, and into which every man first comes after death. (P. 74, footnote.)

By such means the critic attempts to ridicule the entire method of Scripture interpretation by correspondences or symbols. But anyone of spiritual discernment can see ample reason, in the very nature of things, why the objects in this list have such spiritual meanings as Swedenborg finds in them. Why should not Aaron represent divine truth pro-

ceeding from the Lord? Was he not the high priest of Israel? And what else does a priest signify, if not something Divine? It seems quite reasonable, also, especially from the white horse in the *Apocalypse* whose rider's name was called the Word of God (xix, 11, 13), that a horse in general should signify spiritual understanding, and in the best sense, enlightened spiritual understanding from the Word of God. And if a horse signifies *spiritual* understanding, why should not an ass signify such *natural* understanding as Professor Horton exemplifies, and thus also truth adapted to such understanding?

We come now to a more serious objection, by which the author tries to excuse himself from further discussion of Swedenborg's supernatural claims:

> Or if that experiment fail then let him compare what Swedenborg reports (on angelic authority) about life on Jupiter, Mars and the moon, with what one learns in grammar-school about conditions in those parts of the solar system. (See Swedenborg's "Earths in the Universe," or "Heaven and Hell," no. 417.) (Pp. 74-75.)

The assumption underlying this objection is that any Divine Revelation, or what is reputed to be a Divine Revelation, must be so written as to agree in all respects with the scientific ideas, not only of the age in which it was promulgated, but of all subsequent ages, and especially of Professor Horton's day. If any Divine Revelation, or reputed Divine Revelation, does not measure up to this standard, it must be rejected or discredited. Just apply this rule of criticism to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Are not, then, the sceptics, atheists, and infidels generally, quite justified, on Professor Horton's assumption, in rejecting the whole Bible as a mere record of exploded superstition? Do not the Scriptures abound with unscientific conceptions, miracles, and beliefs which no modern man of science has succeeded in verifying? Do they not imply that the earth is flat, and say that creation took only six days? Do they not narrate many things repugnant to the wisdom of the modern scientist? Let Professor Horton carry out

his implied major premise to its logical issues, and see where it must drive him. There is no escape for him, as there is for the pious Swedenborgian, in "allegorical" interpretation of the Bible, for has not Professor Horton completely rejected all "allegorical" interpretation of Scripture?

The disciple of Swedenborg, however, knows that a Divine Revelation attempts to convey, not scientific information, but universal spiritual truth. How, then, can the universal spiritual truth which must be found in "Earths in the Universe" be disclosed, except by application of Swedenborg's own science of correspondences to his text? For otherwise we are shut up to matter which, in its obvious meaning, is unworthy of a Divine Revelation, quite as much, in its way, as are many things in the literal sense of Genesis, Exodus, Samuel, or Kings. We venture to suggest, therefore, that when the correspondences in the text of this book are explained according to the spiritual meanings which Swedenborg regularly gives to them, the true message and meaning of this curious work will fully appear to the enlightened mind of the man of the New Church. This, however, is a piece of work which we have no expectation of persuading Professor Horton to undertake, for it requires a more affirmative attitude to Divine truth than his book reveals.

After all he has said against Swedenborg's system, even calling in question the seer's sanity (p. 60), Professor Horton remarks:

> But quite apart from his extravagant claims, Swedenborg commands our interest and respect as a religious thinker, who met the peculiar problems of the Newtonian world in a very effective way, and whose reconciliation of science and theism has become a model for many since his day. (P. 75.)

He then proceeds to outline in a fairly adequate way the "Swedenborgian universe" (pp. 75-78). But he betrays considerable ignorance by the following remarks:

> "A future interpreter," says Kant, "will conclude . . . that Swedenborg was an idealist, because he denies to this material world

its independent subsistence, and therefore must hold it to be only a systematic appearance, arising from the constitution of the spirit world." This remark, which Kant made half jestingly, is really a very good key to Swedenborg's system. (P. 78.)

By dissolving the natural world into a pure phenomenon, he [Swedenborg] gave science its rights within that limited sphere. (P. 80.)

The purpose of this attempt to ascribe philosophical idealism to Swedenborg is evident from Professor Horton's conclusion about idealism at the close of his next chapter, curiously combined with misunderstanding of Swedenborg:

Idealism is like a soap-bubble; it grows more and more iridescent and alluring as it expands and inflates, but when you try to hitch your basket to it for a balloon ascension to fairyland, it bursts and lets you down. . . . As a final philosophy of life, it has proved to be ill-balanced. And in that judgment the mysticism of Swedenborg, which helped to confirm the idealists in their over-confident mood, also stands condemned. (Pp. 121, 122.)

With this judgment upon idealism we heartily agree, but protest strongly against the attempt to confound Swedenborgianism in any way, shape, or manner, with philosophical idealism. On this subject let us hear Swedenborg's own testimony:

Unless the Infinite God were All, Substance itself, and Wisdom itself, man would not be any thing; therefore either nothing, or only an idea of being, according to visionaries who are called Idealists. (Divine Providence, n. 46.)

It is a paradox, and insanity, to believe that man has life from himself, and that wisdom and prudence do not flow in from God, but are in the man; . . . concerning those (who believe this) it can be said that they are insane . . . [and] even that they are idealists. (*Ibid.*, n. 309.)

Evil spirits know how to conjure up illusions of many kinds before those who come fresh from the world, and if they cannot deceive them, they nevertheless thereby endeavor to persuade them that nothing is real, but that all things are ideal, even those which are in heaven. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4, 623.)

You [Ratiocinators] do not know whether there is anything, whether there is anything except an idea, thus whether there is salvation, eternal life after death, whether one Religion is better than the other, and whether there is Heaven and Hell. (True Christian Religion, n. 333.)

It is clear from these passages that Swedenborg entirely repudiated idealistic philosophy. His system may be called one of spiritual realism. Idealism it certainly is not. On this point Kant was quite mistaken, and so also is Professor Horton.

Professor Horton's discussion of Swedenborg in connection with modern religious thought, defective as it is, must be considered significant, as showing some appreciation of his historical importance:

> This dreamer accomplished what many have failed to accomplish by close reasoning; and he set a model for the solution of the science-religion problem which many soberer thinkers were destined to follow in the next generation. . . . Swedenborg must be named, along with Jacob Boehme and Spinoza, as one of the chief progenitors of the idea of the immanence of God, which flows through all the thought of the early nineteenth century. (P. 81.)

For even this much recognition of Swedenborg's impression, we ought to be duly grateful. Yet the final impression Professor Horton's comment leaves on us is a profound sense of the truth of Saint Paul's declaration:

> The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. (I *Cor.* II, 14.)

As to Swedenborg's being called a dreamer, even to that we have no special objection, if only he be classed with such "dreamers" as Jacob, Moses, Joseph, Daniel, Ezekiel, and Saint John. For dreams were regarded by the ancients (whom Professor Horton may be too sophisticated to consider as of any account whatever) as means of conveying Divine revelations; and from the merely natural man's point of view, religion itself, at least in any original revelation of it, is a form of insanity. But the kind of "insanity" which the prophets of Scripture manifested was nevertheless regarded, not without reason, as a priceless revelation of the Divine benignity to the human race; and such is our estimate, also, of the Writings of Swedenborg.

CLARENCE HOTSON.

"GOD AND THE UNIVERSE"

THE substance of the chapters in Mr. Harley's "God and the Universe"* originally formed the basis of a series of public lectures whose purpose was to relate the facts and theories put forward by Sir James Jeans in his book, "The Mysterious Universe," to the philosophy of creation set out in the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg. The first three chapters are mainly devoted to the "facts and theories," the last to their bearing on Swedenborg's philosophy and theology.

In chapter one, entitled "The Expiring Sun," Mr. Harley considers that old hypothesis of the running-down universe which has so often disturbed the faith of believers in an overruling Providence. He is content to quote Jeans's proviso that such a running-down is predicated on the supposition that solar radiation "is fed from no extraneous source," and he points to such a source in the spiritual sun; but his case would have been much strengthened if he had introduced at this point Millikan's hypothesis of a rebuilding universe instead of postponing it to chapter two. In fact, the "heat death" theory always has had a fatal logical defect in that it fails to account for the original winding-up. We are in the position of children brought up on a one-way street, who might imagine that all the traffic would ultimately be jammed up at one end. Even if Millikan has not located the compensating traffic lane, its existence may confidently be predicted. Mr. Harley is quite right in pointing to a source of power extrinsic to the "heat death" process, and operating to produce both devolution and evolution.

In chapter two, "The New World of Modern Physics,"

**God and the Universe;* a Sympathetic Examination of the Book by Sir James Jeans, "The Mysterious Universe," from the Standpoint of the Philosophy and Theology Contained in the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg. By the Rev. Clifford Harley. Manchester, Eng.: New-Church Publishing Society. [1933.] 58 pp., 16mo. Cloth, 60c.

we are told how studies of least particles, particularly the principle of indeterminacy to which they have given rise, have undermined the idea of predictable causality in nature, destroying at one and the same time the mechanistic conception of the universe as a whole and the mechanistic conception of the human microcosm in particular, since that which is unpredictable in its manifestations partakes proportionately more of the character of life and proportionately less of mechanistic law.

In discussing "Relativity and the Trend Away from Materialism," Mr. Harley is not so happy, because relativity is at the same time less well settled in the frame of modern scientific thought and more difficult to comprehend. Whether there is or is not an ether is less important than he seems to suppose, because relativity must be predicated of substance, and if we replace the term "ether" with "space" we merely change nomenclature and have substance to deal with just the same; or perhaps I should say that we thereby change "space" from a concept into a substance. The correctness of Swedenborg's general doctrine of discrete degrees is seen clearly enough in the various levels of composition of the atom which, when all is said, involve real substances, whether these exist within the frame of a Newtonian universe or in a relativistic one. Mr. Harley points out, very justly, that Swedenborg is in agreement with relativity when he declares that space and time came into existence only with the material universe, though I do not recall that he says anywhere that they exist only for the perceiving mind. In fact, Swedenborg is rather severe on idealists.

This modern interpretation of the universe, says Mr. Harley, "leads us further and further away from mechanism and materialism," and he holds that it is preparing the mind for "an entirely new philosophy of creation," that is, "The New-Church Philosophy of Creation," which he proceeds to set forth in his concluding chapter. As implied in the sub-title of this volume, his attitude toward the trend of modern scientific investigation is an affirmative

one. He traces the creation and its organic inhabitants to the successive addition of something from the Creator to what has been already created. One such addition to the mineral plane produced the vegetable; another added to the vegetable plane gave rise to the animal; and man came about by the addition of something to the animal.

If new discoveries in science were not accompanied by new philosophical implications, and if theology never undertook to stipulate what science must or must not find, there would be small occasion for disagreement between them. Rather the one would enrich and illustrate the other. Then religion would not be indifferent to scientific advance, but would seize upon each forward step as a new clue, and seek eagerly for the spiritual reality which lay behind it. But, even as things are, reverent scientists and reverent theologians alike will examine carefully the causes of disagreement, and compose their differences in the spirit of those who make truth their end and aim. Most principles of which men on both sides complain will be found to be at the same time unscientific and unphilosophical. One instance is the "heat death" theory considered above. Another is the production of life from inert atoms. A third is the attribution of power, in the shape of attractive force, to aggregates of matter, as implied in the classical wording of the law of gravitation.

Even a scientist who does not happen to have devoted particular attention to a branch other than his own finds it difficult to handle the data of that science accurately; and, if he does so, the discipline may leave him behind almost before he is aware of it. Mr. Harley's work is likely to suffer in the same manner. Yet most of the principles with which he strives to grapple are sufficiently universal in character to remain permanent subjects for consideration and discussion, and his booklet will serve to compose some of the fears of the lay New-Churchman regarding the supposedly devastating effects of scientific advance upon religious beliefs.

JOHN R. SWANTON, PH. D.

"NEW LIGHT UPON THE PROBLEM OF REINCARNATION"*

WE wish to express the great pleasure we found in this little pamphlet as the work of an Indian New-Churchman, to whom we wish all success. But it is too involved and too labored. It was pronounced "inconclusive" by one reader, to whom we loaned it. The very title is misleading. Reincarnation is *not* a problem, because there is no such thing as reincarnation; it is only a theory, and one that the High Priestess of Theosophy, Mrs. Annie Besant, admitted could not be proved. It is really a matter of interpretation.

Mr. Chetty quotes the passage in "Heaven and Hell" (n. 256) where Swedenborg mentions the experiences that have led some persons to believe in this theory. To judge the theory correctly, we must view it in the light of Swedenborg's statement. If Mr. Chetty had done this, he would have made his task much simpler, and would not have become lost in the intricasies arising from misconceptions.

Swedenborg admits that a very unusual spiritual experience sometimes happens, when the memory of an accompanying spirit flows into the mind of a living man, who thereupon seems to remember things that really belong to the mind of the accompanying spirit. Because he then seems to remember as belonging to himself things that were truly part of the memory of a person long since dead, and because he is quite ignorant of the constant presence of spirits with him, he concludes that he must have lived at some previous period, which seems to return vividly to mind. That is really the basis of the theory of reincarnation. There is no need to involve it with the ideas of creation, the growth of the soul, its nature, etc., as Mr. Chetty has done. The points made by him with regard to Indian Philosophy are valuable, but they hardly concern the main subject of his pamphlet.

India, embracing perverted religious ideas at the time

**New Light upon the Problem of Reincarnation.* By D. Gopaul Chetty. Madras, India: D. Gopaul Chetty. Pamphlet, 36 pp., 4d. (For sale at Mass. New-Church Union for 15c.)

when the Ancient Church had perished, has perhaps been subject to spiritual obsessions more than other regions. She has outlived Egypt, and has retained many terrible forms of obsession. Mr. Chetty might be able to provide instances of experiences of Indian people in this matter; and we might then have an opportunity of explaining the true significance of the experiences. It is along this line that we were moved to write our story entitled "A Touch of Reincarnation" which appeared in the *New-Church Herald* for Jan. 27th and Feb. 3rd last.

L. ERIC WETHEY.

NOTE

The question of continuing the publication of THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW beyond the present issue was referred to the Massachusetts Association of the New Jerusalem Church at its meeting in Brockton, Mass., on October 12th, and was fully discussed. When put to a vote, a resolution was adopted recommending that the publication of THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW by the Massachusetts New-Church Union be temporarily suspended after its issue of October, 1934. The General Council of the General Convention of the New Jerusalem will be asked to consider the matter at its meeting in January, 1935.

Christmas Cards
Easter Cards

Celebrating the Birth and the Resurrection of Christ

Choice cards both of foreign and of domestic manufacture. Prices of Christmas Cards from 5 to 50 cents; of Easter Cards, 5 and 10 cents. Mail orders solicited, and satisfaction guaranteed.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the

Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

SWEDENBORG'S WRITINGS

STANDARD EDITION, 30 vols., dark green cloth, $30.00, or $1.00 per vol. postpaid.

ROTCH EDITION, 32 vols., blue linen buckram, gilt top, $40.00; brown half morocco, full gilt, $125.00; sold only in sets, transportation at cost of purchaser. Separate titles of the Rotch Edition at special prices as shown in booklist sent upon request.

Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.

Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

SUBSCRIBE NOW FOR THE SWEDENBORG STUDENT

The Swedenborg Student is a monthly magazine, edited by Rev. Arthur Wilde, to help in the study of the Writings. It contains also the monthly Bulletin of the Arcana Reading Class.

Subscription price $1.00 per year.

To encourage new members to join the Reading Classes, the Swedenborg Student for one year and the first volume of the "Arcana Cœlestia," Standard Edition, are offered together for $1.50.

SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION

Incorporated

18 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room 369 So. Maple St., Room 6.
Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center. 3812 Barrington Road.
Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union. Rooms 1745-6, 17 N. State St.
Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak Street and Winslow Avenue.
Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
New York, N. Y. Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights.
Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.
Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street, N.W.
Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 561 Yonge St.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.
Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland. 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay. Swedenborg Society of India, A. E. Penn, Sec., 23 Sussex Road, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Geneva. Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 22 Rue de la Confederation.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

GEORGE C. WARREN, *President*,
CHARLES N. MASON,
JOHN W. HATHAWAY, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.